INFORMATION FOR THE PEOPLE.

Heads of Departments.

Mr. Howe's Reply to Mr. Wilkins, Feb. 1846.

Mr Howe had examined the Journals of the House for the last ten years, that he might argue the simple question presented by this Bill, with reference only to the facts by which its passage or rejection ought to be decided; but the extraordinary harangue just made by the hon. and learned Member for Hants, compelled him to put aside the materials collected, in order that he might follow the learned gentleman through the wider field over which he had careered. That person, said Mr H. warned his Constituents (who less, perhaps, than any portion of our people, required his caution) not to be 'cajoled' by artful and eloquent members of this House; but I heard him deliver the same speech at four or five public meetings in his own County, and I had the satisfaction to see him flying from the indignant faces of his own Constituents, with vollies of hisses in his ears; or, when he did not fly, sitting in minorities of half a dozen. We have listened to the same speech for eight or ten years, and I have again and again torn it to tatters, and I now return to the sickening task with feelings of pity and contempt; nay, sir, I tell the learned member that he would not have been here to day to repeat it, had he not, at the last election, laying his hand on the horns of the altar (for he spoke in a Church, and grasped the pulpit) referred to the principles of the man he defames, and pledged himself to support that man and those principles when he came here.

Mr Wilkins denied that assertion.

The Speaker interfered—he could not allow this interruption. The rule of the House was against it, and it must be observed.

The Attorney General would support the Chair in preserving that rule.

Mr Howe proceeded. It makes no difference. I have heard the hon. member deny it before—in the midst of his own Constituents—but more than thirty men immediately rose, in all parts of the room, and indignantly charged him with making the pledge. The hon. and learned member told us that, in the olden time, persons went to the Colonial Office, and used back door influence to obtain patronage or promote their own interests, and he would have us believe that the system was at an end. But, was there ever a more palpable misstatement? The only difference is, that the Officers are saved the expense of a voyage. Does he not support a Government, a single Member of which, by a letter that has been carefully concealed from this House and the Country, last year defeated a Bill passed by the three Branches of the Legislature, and by which a large sum would have been saved to the Province? There were back door influence and secret intrigue, yet the learned gentleman concealed the correspondence and justified the writer! Sir, I have heard many slavish harangues from the learned member, in which he ever depreciated the talents and capacity of his countrymen, and sought to destroy their liberties, but never one so repugnant to the manly spirit of personal independence which prevail in England, or so unworthy to be propagated here. He tells us that in the Mother Country every knee is bent as the Sovereign passes along, and he would have us, I suppose, kneel to her Representative, and pronounce his name with awe. Why, Sir, do we not know, that the Sovereign, when surrounded by obnoxious Ministers—when governing by back stair influence, or personal intrigue, has often been hissed while passing through lines of averted faces, to meet the Parliament? And did not Englishmen, when their liberties were invaded by an incorrigible Tyrant, bring him to the block? The learned member criticized the vehement gesticulation of my learned friend from Pictou. He, who never speaks without reminding us of the card men the children make, whose animation springs, not from any vigour of intellect, but from the string between their legs.

The learned member told us that the Constitution of Nova Scotia was the work of a Colonial Secretary. I deny the fact. Our Constitution was worked out on the floor of this House—by the conflict of Colonial opinion—by the energy and sagacity of Nova-Scotians themselves, aided by a combination of circumstances in the other Colonies. Lord Glenelg never yielded one concession till it was asked by this Assembly—Lord John Russell wrote no Despatches not based on our Constitutional demands—and Lord Sydenham worked out the new system by and with the aid of the leading minds in this Assembly. Nor can a Colonial Secretary destroy our Constitution—it will be guarded, expanded and preserved, by successive generations of intelligent men, in spite of the unnatural attempts of such persons as the learned member for Hants. That gentleman tells us that all important appointments have been given by the present Government to Representatives of the People—let us remind him of the three late appointments made to the Legislative Council, not one ever represented a Constituency in Nova Scotia, though one had borne a high office in the municipality of Halifax. He tells us that the Governor is 'no where.' I do not understand his meaning, but may say that if he were any where else but in Nova Scotia, few would be very sorry. The learned gentleman deplores the selfish ambition, and absence of moderation, in his opponents, but we can scarcely compare, in these respects, with the supporters of the present Government. Have they not grasped at every office that has fallen vacant, and divided them among them? Do they not seek to withdraw the recipients from this House, that they may hold those offices for life unchecked by popular control?—Were not three silk gowns given to three Lawyers in the Western section of the Province, the claims of seniors being slighted, and the Eastern Counties being left without Counsel for the Crown? The learned gentleman exhibited some selfishness and but little moderation in claiming his share of the spoils. He tells us that Lord Metcalfe and we are opposed. I deny the fact. Are we pressing for anything more than that Nobleman acknowledged in Canada? Did he not govern by a Parliamentary

1846
(20)

majority, working through Heads of Departments?—Did not Lord Sydenham and Sir Charles Bagot do the same? I do not believe, that at this moment there is a man in Canada, of any political party, who would make so servile and abject a speech as that to which we have listened to-day.

The learned member is very anxious about the interests of the minority at the next Election—and asked what would become of them? Why, what becomes of us? We have never excited his sympathies—awakened his solicitude. Here we are, a body of independent gentlemen, bound together by public ties—resisting the blandishments of power—rejecting the sweets of office—taking our stand upon public principles—supporting good measures, and opposing bad ones, and honourably discharging our duties to our Sovereign—to each other, and to our Country. We have asked for nothing—got nothing. Let those who charge us with ambition and selfishness copy our example, and follow in our footsteps, if they are left in a minority.—If they copy us, they will secure public confidence—if we copy them we are certain to lose it. But, Sir, should parties change sides, our difficulties will not arise from any selfishness or want of moderation in our own ranks—they will not proceed from the manly and disinterested Conservatives, who will go into opposition. Our difficulty will be to deal with such 'loose fish' as the learned member, who will support any Government—ask patronage and take it from any Administration, and who swim into any pool which happens to be full. How can we resist the claims of Conservative gentlemen, who go into distant Counties with old Newspapers in their hands—applauding our acts, and swearing by our opinions? The Opposition may have committed errors and have had their faults, but a more manly, public spirited, united, and disinterested body of men, were never exhibited by the Legislative conflicts of any Country. What right has the learned member to upbraid such men? Has he evinced any repugnance to take office? Had the Governor to chase him over the marshes of Hants, and to tie his legs, before the silk gown could be forced over his shoulders? Or did the learned member, the moment he saw it fluttering in the breeze, leap into its folds, with an eagerness that only evinced how ready he was for an office more lucrative and honorable? I will tell the learned member how a minority should be protected—first, by the justice of the party in power; and next, by the force of public opinion. A party may form the Government, but once formed, it should discharge the Sovereign's obligations to the whole country. By justice it will widen its base—injustice will narrow it—and if unjust, public opinion will arm the minority with strength to overturn it. Let the learned member take comfort, then—he will not be without his remedies. The learned member reproaches me with saying Lord Stanley was shelved. I said that the reasons given in England for his removal, by the Press of all parties, was the mismanagement of Colonial affairs. Whether this be true or not, it cannot be disputed, that three Colonial Secretaries, avowing and acting on the principles of the member for Hants, would separate North America from the British Crown, and no power on earth could avert the dissolution of ties, that would no longer be worth possessing. If he were a patriotic and loyal Nova-Scotian, he would seek to elevate his Countrymen—not to depress them: to bind them to England by kindred sympathies, not by sneaking servility, and abject fear. Lord Sydenham declared, had he been a Colonist—so rotten and defective was the old system which the learned gentleman admires, that he would not have fought to maintain it.—Let us have a Constitution that we can fight for, and then the generous ties that bound us to our fatherland can never be rent assunder.

Sir, are we to have a system of Government sneered at, that has been granted to us by the authority of British Statesmen—are we to believe that men, sprung from British stock as we are, will, in these new countries, which God has given us for a home, be content with less of liberty than is enjoyed by our brethren in the parent land—shall we be satisfied with a less liberal system of self-government than that which our fore fathers won by their blood? No, Sir! Just as the men of these North American Colonies are as vigorous in frame, and manly in action, and sensible in mind, as those who are born on the soil of the United Kingdom, so are we as fit as they to enjoy the blessings of freedom, and as worthy to have a voice in the management of our own affairs. Tell me that any Englishman, or Irishman, or Scotchman, would thank us to maintain such servile principles as are advocated by the learned member for Hants? No! for they know that by such struggles as those in which we are now engaged, were the free principles of British Responsibility won, and the constitution they revere purified and maintained. * * * * The Hon. Member has talked to us of 'the leading minds.' Why, who conducts the Government now? The leading minds of the Conservative Party. Aye! and if a Royal Duke were sent here—one of the brightest Statesmen on the other side of the water, commended by every quality of head and heart, who would exercise over him a weighty influence from the moment he sat his foot upon our shores until the hour of his departure? Why, the gentlemen who surround him in his council,—Aye! every friend they have, every member of this House, would exercise a legitimate influence over the Executive. Why did not Lord Falkland carry his arrears the other day? Because three or four plain country gentlemen refused to sustain his Government. Had not this species of influence been largely exercised upon his Lordship during the last two years, his Government would have been scattered to the winds.

Mr. Howe here stated that he did not wish to detain the house, as the hour of adjournment had arrived, and on an agreement that he should resume next morning, the House adjourned with the debate.

Mr Howe rose and said, that the very unexpected, gratuitous, and ardent personal attack, made upon him last evening by the learned member for Hants, had, he feared, betrayed him into a warmth of expression foreign to the subject before the House, and not exactly in keeping with the tone of calm deliberation which ought to distinguish the Assembly. The attack made upon him had been unprovoked by any thing he had said or done this Session, and had therefore taken him by surprise; but, on reflection, he had come to the conclusion that the learned gentleman had been nursing his wrath since the glowing days of summer, and had hoped to recover here, with a majority at his back, the laurel torn from his brow in fair encounter before his own Constituents. But, said Mr H. the sun rarely goes down upon my anger, and balmy sleep is a blessing sent by Providence to calm the angry passions: I come therefore, this morning, to dissect the learned gentleman's arguments without a tincture of excited feeling.

The learned gentleman never wearies of denouncing the idea that the "leading minds" of North America are to govern these noble possessions, by the Constitutional forms, and in the same wise and loyal spirit of mutual forbearance, by which the dignity of the throne is upheld, and the liberties of the people are preserved by the "leading minds" at home. His idea of a perfect Colonial Government, is a Governor to whom all knees shall bow—all interests give place—all forms yield, and to whom, however wanting in temper or deficient in intellect, the wise and patriotic natives of the country shall tender no advice and offer no resistance. Carry out his theory, and these Colonies are lost. But, Sir, has his theory ever been reduced to practice here? look back for forty years, and show me a Governor that two or three clever men did not rule.—Sir John Wentworth, Sir Peregrine Maitland, Sir James Kempt, Sir Colin Campbell, were all either governed or

largely controlled by the adroit and able men by whom they were surrounded—by the leading minds of the day. So it must ever be, because the strong minds that nature produces generally stay at home, while the weaker ones, that can be spared in England, the gleanings of the Peerage or the Army, are often sent to govern, and must succumb to a range of intellect beyond the elevation of their own. Who governs Nova Scotia at this moment? The learned member will tell us—Lord Falkland. I tell him—the Attorney General opposite, to as large an extent, with as absolute an influence, as Sir Robert Peel, in England—aye, and with a tenure of power more secure, because every Constitutional avenue of refuge has been closed.

The learned Gentleman informs us that respect for Governors is wearing away in Nova Scotia. I deny the fact. The office is still held in high respect by the people—if the individual who fills it has forfeited their esteem, it is much to be deplored, though on this topic I have no wish to dwell. The experience of the past two years has shown all parties the folly of introducing the Governor's name into our discussions—it ought not to be brought here, because it should never be used to influence debate, and if so used will ever lead to criticism and retort. The learned Gentleman has raked up an old Newspaper, and charged me with having changed some opinions expressed in 1835. Suppose I had, Sir—what then? I am ten years older now than I was in 1835, and I hope a little wiser, and if my increased experience had shown some opinion to be unsound—some theory to be impracticable—I would come forward like a man (as Lord John Russell did the other day) and announce my recently formed, it might be, but my deliberate conviction. But let us see what were those strange opinions which I expressed ten years ago? 'That no Governor in North America can hope to govern by patronage alone.' I say so still, and if proof were wanting of the soundness of the maxim, it would be found in the weakness of Lord Falkland's Government at this moment, and in the fact, that, with all the patronage of the Province in his hand, for the last two years, he has not been able to seduce one man from the ranks of the Opposition. I am next charged with asserting 'that a Governor should have no partizans.' I say so still. A Colonial Governor should have constitutional advisers, and be free to select them from any party, and to dismiss them when he pleases, but he should have neither enemies nor partizans. He should preserve a courteous demeanour to men of all parties, and have personal quarrels with none; because he knows not the moment when the honor of the Crown and interests of the Province may require him to call to his aid those who have been the most active in opposition. When Sir Robert Peel's Cabinet was recently broken up, to whom did the Queen send a confidential message? To Lord John Russell, the leader of the opposition—the man who had opposed the Government for years. Her Majesty had neither partizans nor enemies. Lord Falkland could not do this, for he has both—he has quarreled with one party and must rule by the other, or throw up the reins and retire. What I said in 1835, then, has been confirmed and not weakened by our Provincial experience. But I said that a Governor should be 'just to all.' I say so still. Justice to all should be the rule of every Administration. This was the principle upon which we acted when I was in the Government. Whenever it was violated, as perhaps it was in one or two instances, from a want of local information, the reaction was injurious, and it will be found that the present Administration has sealed its fate by a policy which cannot fail to bring down retributive justice.

The learned gentleman tells us that 'the sagacity and intelligence of our Governors are the best security for our liberties.' If these were our only securities, I should pity my Countrymen, and deplore the fate of their children—but I would advise them to rely upon their own sagacity and intelligence, as Providence may sometimes send them rulers with very little of either. On what do we rely at this moment? On the Governor—No! but on the control which our own sagacity and intelligence gives us over the learned gentlemen opposite, who are bound to sit here and defend every exercise of the prerogative. Suppose the most able men in the Empire were selected, they must come here ignorant of a thousand things without a knowledge of which there could be no good government.—The member for Kings is a shrewd and clear-headed man, but suppose he was called, at a day's notice, to govern a Province in India—of the language—the geography—the statistics—the prejudices, of which, he was entirely ignorant. What sort of Governor would he make? Nay, take the learned member from Hants himself, and send him as Lord Provost to Glasgow. Let a Herald go before him and proclaim that a 'distinguished' Lawyer, six feet high, deeply read in classic lore, had come over from North America to govern the City, and that the best security for the interests and liberties of the people would be found in 'his sagacity and intelligence.' I think I see the Glasgow Baillies shaking their heads, and coming to the conclusion, that, though he might be a very fine fellow, as he must be ignorant of ten thousand things that a Lord Provost should know, it might be as well to rely a little on their own 'sagacity and intelligence.' Now, Sir, I rely upon my own Countrymen for the good government of Nova Scotia, and, without undervaluing the rulers who may be sent, I may safely prophesy that they will generally find here more intellect and information than they will bring.

The member from Hants made the singular assertion that the present Government had advocated a moderate scale of salaries—but he knows that they demanded £1680 per annum more than we would give them, and that the saving of that sum must be placed to the credit of the Opposition. The learned gentleman has again turned to Lord Sydenham's private letters, to search for something at variance with his public acts and principles. Sir, I have ever protested against the course which our Colonial Tories have pursued towards the memory of Lord Sydenham, in seeking to convict him of double dealing and insincerity—by which he would appear a Charlatan and not a Statesman. Who denies that Lord Sydenham may have written that he had put down the cry for Responsible Government 'in its inadmissable sense?' Who would blame him if he did? But can it be shown that Lord Sydenham did not sanction Responsible Government 'in the sense in which we understand it?' That he did not work it by Heads of Departments? Lord John Russell, we are told, is against us, but do not his Despatches recognize the system, and was he not in office till Lord Sydenham died? But, we are told that Lord Metcalfe condemns us. In hazarding the assertion I make, perhaps some of my own friends may differ with me; but, from a pretty extensive reading of Colonial Newspapers and documents, I have come to the conclusion, that Lord Metcalfe has put forth, either under his own hand, or from the mouths of his Constitutional Advisers, more authoritative and explicit avowals of sound principles of Colonial Government than all his predecessors put together. The learned member considers the Canadian Government but as 'an experiment.' Aye, Sir, and he might have added, that it is an experiment that never would have been tried if such sages as he could have interposed It is an experiment for the success of which he should pray duly night and morn, for if it fails, then indeed all is lost. But, Sir, that experiment will not fail, either in Canada or here—and God forbid it should, even though it may prevent the learned member from sporting his figure in Congress, or discharging the onerous duties of President of the United States. No, Sir, British Representative Government, fairly and legitimately worked in North America, will perpetuate our connexion with Great Britain. Deprive us of that, and establish the petty despotism that the learned gentleman prefers, and fleets and

armies would be sent and railroads constructed in vain.

The learned member was certainly not very consistent, when, after he had attacked Lord Durham who was dead, and the Speaker, who was nailed to the Chair, he reproached me with triumphing over a nobleman who was merely out of office. Now, if I had attacked Lord Stanley, the organ of the Government sets me the example of assailing Lord John Russell, because he is out of office. But I said nothing of the late Secretary except a general reference to the causes assigned by the British Press. I never blamed Lord Stanley for the "pretensions" Despatch—misinformed by exparte statements, carefully concealed, any man might have written it. But surely his Lordship, whether in or out of office, can never be quoted as authority against Heads of Departments. What said he, in the great Canadian Debate:

"He understood by 'Responsible Government' that the administration of Canada was to be carried on by the Heads of Departments, enjoying the confidence of the people of Canada, responsible to the Legislature of Canada, responsible for the exercise of the functions in those departments; and more, that the Governor, in propounding and introducing with his sanction, legislative measures to the Parliament of Canada, was to be guided by the advice of those whom he has called to his Councils, and to introduce measures upon their advice, they taking the responsibility of conducting their measures through Parliament."

But I was told that I could not stand five minutes under the lash of the great Imperial Gladiator. I have seen the arena, and I have seen the men, and far be from me the vanity to compare with their chief in temper of weapon or strength of arm; but this I will say, that, if the cause were good, I would rather be cut down, and fall with my face upturned to the foe, than fly before him, as I have seen a learned Craven do more than once in the fertile County of Hants. Sir, I respect Colonial Secretaries and Members of Parliament, but I abhor that spirit of tuft hunting toadyism, which leads some persons to seek for infallible wisdom under a Coronet, and to undervalue every thing in our own Country, and to worship what comes from abroad.

In the matter of Lords, as of other things, we have learned in Nova Scotia, that sometimes 'distance lends enchantment to the view,' and that figures which overawe by their magnitude and proportions, seen through the haze of the broad Atlantic, on a nearer approach are reduced to their proper dimensions. In the Mother Country rank is respected, and the artificial distinctions of Society are preserved, but there are Commoners who have outshone the Peerage, and taken a more enduring hold of the people's affections. What Scotchman would not exchange, for Wallace—Knox—and Burns, the whole Peerage of his Country? What Irishman that does not prize Grattan, Curran, Burke, O'Connell, above all who were or are their superiors in rank, but their inferiors in genius? I turn to the Sister Kingdom, from which my stock springs, and am not ashamed to acknowledge that I am heart and soul a Saxon; but give me Hampden, Shakespeare, Milton, Pitt and Fox, and I'll give you as many Lords as would stand between this and Fresh Water Bridge. The learned Gentleman always reminds me of the old Jacobite Cavalier, who told his son to bow to the Crown if he saw it on a bramble. My reverence for the Crown is founded on the constitutional privileges and high powers with which it is invested—my veneration for my Sovereign is evoked by her virtues. In England the People look up to the Peerage, as the basement and shaft of the pillar may be said to look up to the capital, with a consciousness of strength which tempers admiration for the ornament they sustain.

But, Sir, I was surprised to hear the learned Gentleman claiming for one Nobleman all deference and respect, while trampling upon the memory of another. Lord Durham, he tells us, 'was no Statesman.' May we not ask him—as the Yankee asked Sam Slick—'Who made you a Judge?' For really we have never seen any exhibitions of statesmanship, that would entitle the learned member for Hants to set himself up for an authority. He compared me to an Owl,—in his own County the learned gentleman goes by the soubriquet of 'the Stately Bird,' and of this I am sure, that wherever the Government Carcase is, there will he be found. When he assailed Lord Durham he reminded me of the clown in Hamlet knocking about Yorick's bones—or of that long eared quadruped, who is said to have kicked a Lion when he was dead. Lord Durham no Statesman! Why, Sir,—there is one single conception of that great man's mind—the Railroad from Halifax to Quebec, with which North America rings at this very hour, which has called up visions before the eyes of the learned Attorney General, and which, once realized, will supply to these Colonies the vertebræ by which their strength and proportions will be preserved. Sir, such Sages as the learned Member from Hants may affect to sneer at men like Durham and Sydenham, because they are dead, and have nothing to bestow—but let him remember that

"They never die, who fall in a good cause,"

and let him be assured, that successive generations of North Americans will bend over the tombs of these Noblemen with veneration and respect; and that from the spots where they repose will come an emanation of light, and sweet savour of liberty, cheering to the eye and grateful to the sense, long after the principles they propounded have laid the foundations of rational freedom broad and deep within the noble Provinces which their Statesmanship saved to the British Crown. The learned member tells us 'we are not ripe for this system,' but I believe that he would rather see Nova Scotians rotten than ripe. [Mr Howe here discussed the right of consultation—the independence of the Governor—the unrestrained action of Imperial departments, and the security for Imperial interests, provided by the new system, and ever respected by the Opposition. He showed that the self-government claimed here was perfectly compatible with the perpetuity of the connexion.] The learned gentleman tells us self-government will terminate our allegiance—I tell him it will preserve it. Cato required his wife to suckle the children of his servants, that they might become more attached to the family; and I say, let us suck liberty that we may love England. Though my ornithological researches may not have been so extensive as those of the learned gentleman, I have read of an Eagle, that stealing flesh from the Altar of Sacrifice, carried with it a live coal that destroyed its own nest. The Tories of North America may seek to carry away the old forms of Government, from the shrines where they have been devoted for the purification of the People, but let them beware, that successful Sacrilege draws not down the anger of the Gods, and doom them to political destruction.

But Sir, it is time that I should turn to the merits of the Bill before the House. The Member for Hants tells us that the Collector of Excise should not be in this House, because his services are required in his Office. He is a Judge of Probate—why is he here? Are not his services required in his Office, by those who, in the broad County of Hants, have Estates to settle and business to transact? The learned member alluded to the crimes committed by the late Treasurer—the allusion might have been spared—seeing that the Officer is now upon his trial before a Committee of the House. Of the probable results of that investigation I desire to pronounce no opinion, but if it shall appear that the party charged has suffered for the faults of others—that he has been borne down by a combination of circumstances appealing not to the evil passions, but to the better feelings of his nature, then perhaps the learned gentleman may regret having used so harsh a term. My learned friend from Pictou was also in error, in the charges he made against the government, in reference to this matter

—because there is no evidence in the papers before us of a desire to cast a stigma on the dead. The learned member from Hants sketched an imaginary character—a man of talent, and eloquence, but devoid of moral principle, who might hold the Excise Office. With the flights of his imagination I have no concern, but if he made the slightest shadow of a shade of personal reference to the past, I would apply to him the Latin phrase of 'Parthis mendacior,'* which the rules of this House forbid me to translate.

I, too, could draw an imaginary character—a fiction founded upon fact—of a Lawyer who was a Judge of Probate, and member of this House, who originated and advocated a Bill of an ex poste facto character—the object of which was to transfer to his own family an Estate which belonged to other people—a Bill so shameless in its conception, and so opposed to British principles and practice, that the Colonial Secretary trampled it under his feet, and refused to permit it to defile our Statute Book.

I will now turn to the Bill before the House, and to those facts by which I conceive that a necessity for its passage is abundantly disproved. I have opened the Journals, and examined the Public Accounts for the last ten years, and though the time I have already occupied forbids me to trespass much further upon your time, I have marked a variety of facts, and shall leave the books in the hands of Members anxious for information. Mr H. then went back to 1835, and by a variety of references brought out these facts.

That down to the period when the Reformers began to gather strength, and push their enquiries into public affairs, the collection of the Revenue was conducted in a slovenly and negligent manner all over the Province. That from many places no accounts or returns were forwarded —that at many others large balances were overheld from year to year. That persons, living at a distance, and not in the Assembly, had become defaulters, who, if on the floor of the House, would have been brought to an account. That but one defaulter had, within his memory, a seat in the Assembly; which, so far from shielding him, pressed investigation home, and compelled the Executive to take a Judgment over all his property. That the Collector at Windsor, though not in the House, was treated with equal lenity, if lenity it could be called. That the application of the Responsible principle to the Halifax Office had improved it, and that he could show by reference to the accounts of an outport Collector, now in the House, that, from the moment he took a seat here, his transactions had been more narrowly scrutinized. The reason there was a loss at Pictou was, because the Collector's bonds had not been renewed; but no argument could be drawn from that fact, because the same thing had occurred in the case of the Commissioner of the Savings Bank, who was not in the Legislature. Mr. H. also reminded the House that the irregularities at the Treasury had been brought to light by the Legislative action, and searching investigation, of the Liberals themselves.

The Opposition said, Mr Howe, are only opposed to this Bill in so far as it withdraws the Halifax Collector from the operation of the new system, and aims a blow at Responsible Government by Heads of Departments. The Government appeal to the example of Canada, but they have withdrawn the Treasurer from the House, while the Treasurer of Canada sits in Parliament and in the Executive Council. The hon member from Hants appeals to Canada, but the Canada Act excludes Judges and Registrars of Probate. Yet he, being a Judge of Probate, does not propose to withdraw. The English reason does not apply to this Province, because there there are 9000 Excise Officers, who, if allowed to sit, would give to the Government fearful power. In this House we have but three Collectors, and one of these acts with the Opposition. Every body feels thas some improvements are necessary—many, on the Government side, admit that Heads of Departments are indispensable. The course I would recommend, would be, the postponement of the Bill, and the appointment of a Committee, with the Attorney General at its head, to go out and to revise the machinery of all our Departments, and to suggest such improvements as would carry out the new system—supply adequate checks—and, as I believe, ensure an efficient transaction of the public business, with a considerable saving of expense. We now pay, for

	£	s.	d.
Secretary's Office	1941	3	6
Registrar's Do	700	0	0
Nova-Scotia Land Office	808	10	3
Cape Breton Do	722	8	3
Treasurer's Do	600	0	0
Provincial Notes and Saving's Bank	400	0	0
Excise Office	700	0	0
Attorney General	750	0	0
Solicitor General	125	0	0
	6747	1	0

Let us give				
Provincial Secretary	£700			
Clerks—three	637			
Contingencies	116	12	6	
	1454	2	6	
Registration		200	0	0
Land Office	600			
Clerks, &c.	200			
	800	0	0	
Pension for Morris or Crawley		400	0	0
Collector of Excise	600			
1st Clerk	200			
2nd Clerk	100			
	900	0	0	
Attorney General	500			
Solicitor General	200			
	700	0	0	
	5354	2	6	
Present Cost	£6747 1 0			
Proposed Cost	5354 2 6			
Leaving	1392 18 6			

to go into the Treasury, when all necessary expenses were paid.

This is my scheme, said Mr H. one that is safe—easy of accomplishment—securing perfect accountability—giving us efficient Heads of Departments, and inferior Officers adequate to the discharge of their duties, and responsible to the Government and not to their Principals, as they are now. If this plan is adopted our difficulties are at an end. If it is not, let not the Country be told that the Opposition, who seek to save £1300 a year, are seeking to create new offices, and incur heavy expenses. With respect to the Savings' Bank, I find that there are 649 deposits in a year, and 349 sums drawn out, making on an average a little over three transactions a day. The whole duty can be done by a single Clerk, under the control of the Officer at the Head of the Treasury.

Mr. Howe concluded by apologising to the House for the time he had occupied, and by an appeal to the better feelings of all parties for a calm and dispassionate consideration of the subject.

* A greater liar than a Parthian.